

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
24th November, 2015**

Present:- Councillor Sims (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Alam, Astbury, Atkin, Beaumont, Buckley, Burton, Cutts, Elliot, Ellis, Evans, Godfrey, Gosling, Hamilton, Hoddinott, Hughes, Jepson, Jones, Khan, Lelliott, Mallinder, McNeely, Parker, Pickering, Read, Roche, Rose, Rushforth, Russell, Sansome, Smith, Taylor, M. Vines, Wallis, Whelbourn, Wyatt and Yasseen.

Apologies for absence were received from the Mayor (Councillor M. Clark), Councillors Currie, Fleming, Reeder and C. Vines.

CASE IDENTIFICATION MEETINGS AND THE ROLE OF ELECTED MEMBERS.

Councillor K. Sims, Advisory Cabinet Member, welcomed Steve Parry, Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Manager, and Partnership Inspector Martyn Sheldon, Central Area Co-ordinator. A presentation had been prepared in relation to Case Identification Meetings (CIMs) and the role that Elected Members' played within them.

The presentation covered the following areas: -

- 1. Clarity on the purpose of CIMs: -**
 - a. What the meetings are;
 - b. What the meetings are not.
- 2. The Action Plan.**
- 3. The role of Elected Members.**

1. Clarity on the purpose of CIMs: -

- Case Identification Meetings;
- The Terms of Reference had been approved by the Safer Rotherham Partnership Board;
- It was important to emphasise that CIM meetings were not a replacement for day-to-day inter-agency working. Issues should not be saved up for a month to take to the next CIM meeting;
- CIM meetings were not to replace or be seen as an Elected Member Surgery;
- CIM meetings were necessarily time limited and it was suggested that two-hours would be the absolute maximum meeting length;
- CIM meetings would be important forums to maximise resources at a time of reducing resources;
- Discussion and agreement of partnership priorities would happen at CIMs.

2. The Action Plan.

- Owned by the CIM Chair;
- CIMs had to be seen to be completing actions arising from the

discussion/referrals;

- A 'step-down' procedure was required for when actions had been completed and improvements had been achieved;
- Multi-agency information sharing was required in CIMs, and there was legislation to support anyone/any agency making a referral: -
 - The Crime and Disorder Act, 1998;
 - Any person may disclose information to a relevant authority under Section 115 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998, 'where disclosure is necessary or expedient for the purpose of the Act' (reduction and prevention of crime & disorder) – Relevant authorities, Police, Local Authority, Health/CCG, Probation/CRC, Fire Service.
- CIMs operated as confidential meetings and information shared in them would not be shared outside of the meeting;
- A refreshed information sharing agreement for Rotherham was being worked on.

3. The role of Elected Members.

- Elected Members were equal members of CIMs;
- Their local knowledge and experience would be crucial to the process;
- Elected Members would be key in reporting how communities felt about the issues raised;
- It was important for all parties contributing to CIM meetings to maintain an audit trail;
- Responsibility for the action plan would sit with the Chair of the CIM.
- How to bring issues of concern to the CIM: -
 - Concerns initially raised with the Chair at the meeting;
 - Concerns recorded;
 - Resolved/un-resolved at CIM level;
 - Option to progress further through SRP structure – if an action had not been able to resolve the issues at CIM;
 - Details passed to Community Safety as part of wider evaluation of process.

Inspector Martyn Sheldon, Chair of the Central CIM, explained that two CIMs had taken place in his area. Inspector Jenny Lax was responsible for the North area. Inspector Pete Longthorne was temporarily responsible for the South area and it was expected that the arrangements for the long term would be confirmed at some point.

Martyn explained that as many Elected Members as could attend the CIMs would be welcome. As the eyes and ears of the community their contributions were welcome. CIM meetings were proving to be useful arenas for views to be aired.

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 24/11/15

One of the biggest concerns currently reported at CIMs was the reducing number of PCSOs. It was intended that there would be 12 PCSOs within the central area (reduced from 20), and 8 each in the North and South areas. Safer Rotherham Partnership Boards were chaired by PCSO Supervisors, although this role would not exist from April, 2016.

It was important the CIMs were action-led. Actions were wanted and CIMs were not to be just another meeting for meetings sake.

Questions and comments were received from Elected Members. The following issues were raised: -

Councillor Sansome was disappointed that there had been no involvement regarding the new name. Area Assembly Away Days had received/shared information that Elected Members would be consulted with and briefed before changes happened. This had not been the case. Resources were scarce and electors needed to see that processes were effective. Some cases were still going around after eighteen months, which did not give the perception that the meeting was accountable and credible.

Steve Parry responded on how agencies had upped the ante of the chairing and management of the process. Managers needed to manage what was happening at CIM meetings.

The Case Identification Meeting title had been developed at a South Yorkshire level although some areas had personalised the title locally.

Councillor Atkin was glad to hear that Elected Members were welcomed to the meetings. Initially, Elected Members were not close to the structure. Were CIMs replacing NAGs? Are Elected Members trusted partners given the emphasis on confidentiality at this meeting?

Steve referred to concerns raised in the past about confidentiality and data sharing. It was important for all partners to know what to do if they became aware of something at a meeting. Safer Neighbourhood Team meetings were known in the past for achieving outcomes and this would be improved under the CIM structure.

Martyn spoke about the aspiration for CIMs to be the place where Elected Members got involved in targeting where staff were deployed in their local area.

Councillor Roche spoke about the ability for CIM meetings to identify new and emerging hotspots and he shared details of an ASB issue in the North area. Councillor Roche had congratulated Jenny Lax for her response to the matter. Being aware of issues reported at the meeting – without the exact details such as names etc – was a very useful tool to have as an Elected Member.

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 24/11/15

Councillor Ellis thanked the two presenters for their clear presentation and agreed that it was always appropriate to emphasise confidentiality. Was it expected that the Police Inspector and Area Partnership Manager would always be in attendance at every meeting? Previous SNT meetings had had no police participation for three consecutive meetings. Also, could the chair task individuals there, even if from another agency? Councillor Ellis was disappointed that the overarching information sharing agreement had not yet been agreed and had taken eighteen months to get to the stage it was currently at. When would it be ready? If an issue remained unresolved and it was progressed through the SRP structure, who did it go to? This was a problem in the past and agencies needed to learn from it to improve. Some issues never progressed past the SNT stage.

Steve confirmed that as the chair, there should always be a police representative/s at the meeting. The chair had the authority to task individuals through the process. The South Yorkshire Data Officer was looking at the policy for a final quality assurance check.

Unresolved issues would be referred to Superintendent Paul McCurry's monthly meeting, the Performance and Delivery Board.

Councillor Ellis was worried that there was no date for the Information Sharing protocol to be ready. That it was being chased every day and that there was still no completion date rang alarm bells. Did CIM meetings have a right to see that referred issues were on an agenda of another meeting?

Steve confirmed that it would be possible to follow-up items; it was very important to see the audit trail. The plan was that the information protocol would be considered and agreed at the SRP Board in December.

Martyn Sheldon explained that although the information protocol was awaited, there was already a legal basis supporting agencies and individuals in sharing of information at CIMs.

Councillor Wyatt wanted to be positive because CIM meetings represented very important work. He regretted losing parts of the previous structure and he was concerned about losing PCSOs and PCSO Supervisors. Would this contribute to drift in completion of actions? He agreed that it was absolutely right to remind about confidentiality and the legal basis and Elected Member code of conduct in any situation.

Councillor Ahmed asked whether there would be a signing in process for each meeting? She also asked where schools were within the process, along with the Early Help and Families for Change processes? Every concern needed to be recorded, how were the minutes of the meeting captured?

Martyn Sheldon confirmed that the CIM signing-in sheet had a declaration on the top that explained the confidentiality requirements of the meeting.

REPORT FOR INFORMATION - 24/11/15

When attendees signed in, they were confirming their attendance at the meeting and their acceptance of protecting the confidential nature of the meeting.

All actions would be picked-up in the minutes and the action plan, which needed to stand as separate to the minutes.

Steve agreed to progress the schools question and speak to Education colleagues about representatives attending CIMs, although capacity to cover this may be an issue. Secondary schools were represented by IYSS colleagues attending the CIM. Primary schools, who were key partners with access to a lot of intelligence, were not represented in the current structure.

Councillor Mallinder raised an issue where she had not received information about Service developments. She asked about the threshold to bring issues to CIMs.

Steve explained how issues could still be raised and initially responded to by the Councillor surgery process. However, if the issue kept reoccurring it should be forwarded to the CIM.

Martyn Sheldon explained PCSO deployment and committed to providing a contact details and area covered sheet to Elected Members.

Councillor Hoddinott asked whether, if Elected Members could not attend, would they still have copies of minutes and actions sent on to them? How would CIM meetings fit with PACT and monitoring? Hotspots were used by the CSE Evolve Team. Would this feed in to CIMs?

Councillor Jepson explained that in the three years he had been a Councillor, he had never been invited to an SNT or a NAG meeting. Neither had any information been sent on to him about the processes. He had emailed the Director about this.

Councillor Parker asked whether the intelligence provided by Elected Members would contribute to policies that the Police made? Councillor Parker had been told that the Police would not respond to off-road motorbike incidents if they were reported. He had fed this back to the public who had raised the issue with him via a surgery. His constituents had laughed and asked why the public should give the Police information if they did not action anything or even respond?

Councillor Sims thanked Steve Parry and Partnership Inspector Martyn Sheldon for their informative presentation and contributions to the discussion. She hoped that Elected Members would find the CIM meetings they attended worthwhile and productive. She requested a progress report on CIM structures in twelve months' time.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.